

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 158 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Fischer	Mikulski
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Baldwin	Franken	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baucus	Graham	Murray
Begich	Grassley	Nelson
Bennet	Hagan	Paul
Blumenthal	Harkin	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Pryor
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Reid
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Cantwell	Hirono	Rockefeller
Cardin	Hoeben	Rubio
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Isakson	Schumer
Chambliss	Johanns	Scott
Coats	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shaheen
Cochran	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Kirk	Tester
Corker	Klobuchar	Thune
Cornyn	Landrieu	Toomey
Cowan	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Lee	Udall (NM)
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—4

Levin	Sanders
Manchin	Warren

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Boxer

NOT VOTING—2

Chiesa	Risch
--------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

#### BORDER SECURITY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AND IMMIGRATION MODERNIZATION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am not going to ask unanimous consent to call up any amendments or to have any votes or anything, so everybody can relax. But I do want to speak for a minute about the process we are in.

We have now been considering a major piece of legislation for weeks. The chairman and the ranking member of the committee did a masterful job. Even though there are some people still against the bill, there are people for the bill, we are not exactly sure how it is going to come out, but I want to say Senator LEAHY and Senator SESSIONS—but Senator LEAHY particularly, as the chair—could not have done a better job getting the bill printed, printing all of the amendments, staying here through the night, letting the

members of the committee have a lot of time to debate the bill, to amend the bill. The committee did a very good job.

I am planning to vote for the bill. I have not kept that a secret or said anything to the contrary. Of course the amendment process is important. I cannot make that commitment until we see it. If an amendment gets on this bill that undermines some of the important principles, I might have to change my mind. I don't think that is going to happen.

But there is the problem and this is why I am going to stay on the floor until, hopefully, something can be worked out. I am not on the committee. Most of the people on this floor are not on the committee. The committee is representative of a minority group of Republicans and Democrats. The majority of us do not serve on the Judiciary Committee. While we were interested and worked with our friends who are on the committee to suggest important changes that would improve the bill or correct the bill or fix the bill or save money, we were not on the committee to do it. That is the process. I am not complaining about that.

What I am complaining about is when it gets to the floor, you would think the process would allow amendments to be debated so Members such as myself—I serve as chair of the Homeland Security Appropriations Committee. I am not a distant third party to this debate. My whole budget funds this bill. This is what I spend good bit of my time on. The people in my State and constituencies I represent have a lot of interest in this bill. I am not a Johnny-come-lately to this issue. I have things I want to say about it. I wish to have some amendments talked about and voted on. If people want to vote them down, fine. If they want to vote for them, fine. If they want to have 50 votes, fine. If they want to have 60 votes—I just want a chance to talk about my amendment, so I am going to do so right now.

I also want to say there are some amendments—I have a short list of eight or so. Some of them are quite minor. One or two are fairly significant and might need a debate. But part of my group of amendments is completely, to my knowledge, unopposed by anyone. I have Senator COATS as a cosponsor. I have worked openly. I filed amendments, the text of which have been out there for days now. Senator COATS, who is my ranking member—we try to work together in a bipartisan fashion. He has cosponsored several of these amendments.

What I am strongly suggesting is the staff and the leadership managing this bill try to identify, of the amendments that have been filed, those that are noncontroversial, that everyone would agree to. I think there are probably 20 or 30 such amendments. They do not change the underlying agreement. They do not spend any additional money. They fix or modify or improve

sections of the bill. That is our job. That is what we are supposed to do. That is the legislative process.

You know what. If it were not meant to be that way, we should have a rule that says the bill goes to committee and then it doesn't even come to the Senate floor, then it goes over to the House of Representatives, and their committee works on it and they send it to the President.

But that is not what our laws say. Our laws say we should have some debate on the Senate floor.

I have also been here long enough to realize the leadership is trying its best and there are some amendments that are very controversial. I am not new to the Senate. Fine. But what I am talking about is when we get on a major bill such as this and Members work hard to build support and to get bipartisan support, our amendments that are noncontroversial should go first and then controversial amendments could go last.

But that is not what happens around here. What happens around here is the guys who cause all the trouble all the time on every bill—I don't want to name their names because it is not appropriate—but there is a group on the other side, and a few maybe on our side, who are never happy with anything so they file tons of amendments and we spend all of our time worrying about their amendments. Those of us who spend a lot of our time building bipartisan support, who offer amendments that have no opposition, actually never get to those amendments.

This is sad. I basically have had enough. I have tried to be patient all week. I have come every day and said: Are any of these amendments going to get in the queue? That is not the way we are working right now. We are taking the worst amendments, the most controversial amendments, the guys who cause trouble on every single bill, and give them votes on their amendments. Some of them have been defeated 99 to 1, and then everybody gets tired and aggravated and everybody says we are tired, we are aggravated, we are calling cloture. And do you know what happens when cloture is called. All amendments that are not pending, even ones that no one opposes, that could actually help a human being—imagine that, an amendment that actually could help someone—crumble up on the Senate floor and everybody goes home and says, well, that was a wonderful debate.

I am just venting here, but I am saying this is one Senator who is tired of it. More important, my constituents are tired of it. It is not about me, it is about them. They look at this and they say why can't you get that amendment passed? There is no opposition to it. It is good. We have worked on it. It would help.

That is a good question, and I have to say “I have no idea.”

We have voted on all kinds of amendments that are controversial, that are